UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,120	05/31/2005	Marion Detert	104035.283798	8767

7055 7590 09/24/2007

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER	
YU, GINA C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1617	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/24/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/511,120	DETERT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gina C. Yu	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/12/04, 01/10/05, 06/06/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 3-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites, "a mousse-type". This phrase renders the claim vague and indefinite since it is not clear whether the limitation is defined as a mousse or encompasses some other form of a composition. See also claim 15.

The remaining claims are rejected as they depend on indefinite base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dupuis (US 6080392) in view of Muller (US 6221347 B1).

Dupuis teaches mousse composition comprising at least one propellant and at least one anionic hair styling/holding polymer. The reference teaches adding an associative polyurethane in order to improve the rigidity, the expansion and the stability of the mousse since these styling/holding polymers are non-foaming or weakly foaming ones, which suggests that improving stability of a foam composition is a problem that a skilled artisan would be particularly concerned. The anionic polymers are taught in col. 5, line 36- col. 7, line 42, with the anionic polymers of instant claim 5, such as methyl ether/ monoesterified maleic anhydride copolymer, being the most preferred polymers. The weight amount of the anionic polymer ranges from 0.01-5 % by weight relative to the total weight of the composition. See Id. Further adding cationic and/or nonionic polymers are also taught in col. 7, line 64 – col. 8, line 2. See Example 7, which uses 0.5 % of an anionic polymer, 0.5 % of cationic, hydroxyethylcellulose/diallyldimethylammonium chloride copolymer, meeting instant claim 9.

Dupuis does not teach pregelatinized, crosslinked starch derivatives of the instant claim. The reference also does not mention the specific nonionic polymers of instant claim 11.

Muller teaches a method of making compositions for cleaning or caring for the skin or hair which has an aqueous phase containing a pregelatinized, crosslinked starch, particularly hydroxypropyl di-starch phosphate. See Abstract. The starch acts as a stability improver, a viscosity regulator, a (co) emulsifier, a skin feel improving agent, and an agent for improving hairdressing characteristics. See col. 5, lines 23 - 65. The reference suggests application of the starch derivative in hair conditioning compositions, etc., and particularly teaches adding cationic conditioning compound for hair care compositions. See col. 7, lines 19 – 26; Examples 1-3. Using additional thickener is also suggested in col. 8, lines 38 – 44. The application of the pregelatinized starch in an aerosol foaming composition is exemplified in Example 37, which uses a propellant, 0.5 % of hydroxopropylated di-starch phosphate and 0.49 % by weight of Luviskol, nonionic vinyl pyrrolidone polymer. See instant claim 11-13, 19, 20. The reference teaches that example 37 is stable without phase separation. The reference teaches in col. 5, lines 43 –46, "cosmetics containing a starch derivatives to be used according to the invention can be spread very well onto the skin and do not leave behind a sticky feeling", which would have been obvious to the skilled artisan that the spreadability of a hair care composition comprising the same starch derivatives would be also improved. See instant claim 15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to modify the teachings of Dupuis by incorporating pregelatinized starch as motivated Muller because 1) both prior arts are directed to making personal care products, including hair care products and aerosol foaming formulations; and 2) Muller teaches that its pregelatinized starch, such as hydroxypropyl di-starch

phosphate, improves the stability of the composition and improves hairdressing characteristics. The skilled artisan would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully producing a mousse composition with enhanced stability and hair dressing properties without phase separation because Muller exemplifies the application of the pregelatinized starch in an aerosol foaming product.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In *re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-16 of copending Application No. 10/511,124 in view of Poucher's Perfumes, Cosmetics and Soaps (10th ed, 2000), ("Poucher").

The '124 claims are directed to a gel-type composition comprising one or more pregelatinized, crosslinked starch derivatives, one or more anionic polymers and one or more nonionic polymers that meet the limitations of the instant claims.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. While the copending claims do not require the composition to be in mousse-type, foamable aqueous or hydroalcoholic composition comprising propellants, Poucher teaches that formulating a gel-type or mousse-type hair styling composition is an obvious variation that is well known in the art. See p. 278-279. The reference teaches that styling mousse is used to improve body, texture and control of the hair mass. See p. 278, bridging par.

It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to modify the gel-type styling composition of the '124 claims to a mousse type styling composition, as motivated by Poucher, because the latter teaches that styling mousse improves body, texture and control of the hair mass.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1, 3-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9, 12-17 of copending Application No. 10/511,122 in view of Poucher's Perfumes, Cosmetics and Soaps (10th ed, 2000), ("Poucher").

The '124 claims are directed to a hair care composition comprising one or more pregelatinized, crosslinked starch derivatives, one or more polymers selected from cationic, anionic, and nonionic polymers that meet the limitations of the instant claims.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. While the copending claims do not require the composition to be in mousse-type, foamable aqueous or hydroalcoholic composition comprising propellants, Poucher teaches that a mousse-type hair styling composition improves body, texture, and control of the hair mass. See p. 278-279.

It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to modify the invention of the '122 claims to a mousse type styling composition, as motivated by Poucher, because the latter teaches that styling mousse improves body, texture and control of the hair mass.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gina C. Yu whose telephone number is 571-272-8605. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 8:00AM until 5:30 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gina Yu

Gina C. Yu
Patent Examiner